



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

PENAL FARM SITE CHOSEN

The idea of a court of rehabilitation to determine when prisoners are fit to be returned to society was first given prominence some years ago by Roland B. Molineaux, and has since been strongly urged in Texas. Such a court, as usually conceived, will be a court of record to try a person for release on the evidence of his conduct in prison. If he has been given an indeterminate sentence, as the commission urges, the court can diminish or prolong his term as it sees fit.

The commission declares: "While perfect justice cannot be expected from any human instrumentality, it is conceived that a single court, acting for the entire state, and sitting as a Board of Parole or Court of Rehabilitation will be much more apt to administer an equal justice than is possible under the present system. Under such a system it will be the prisoner and not the crime that will be tried.

Pending the creation of such a court, the commission recommends the establishment of local advisory boards, of three or five members each, for each prison and reformatory, for the purpose of investigating all applications for pardon or parole.

Believing that the greatest obstacle in the way of real prison reform in the state is the confusion and demoralization in the prison administration, the commission urges as the necessary ground work of all other changes the consolidation of all offices, boards and commissions into a permanent state department of correction. In this it recommends the vesting of the entire penal administration of the state.

Among its other recommendations are a separate institution for the care of all adult mental defectives convicted of crime; the "honest, efficient and business-like administration" of all systems of prison labor in the state; the creation of an employment bureau for paroled and discharged prisoners in the office of the superintendent of prisons; and the establishment of a thorough system of education in the penal institutions under the state commissioner of education.—From *The Survey*, May 23, 1914. R. H. G.

Penal Farm Site Chosen by Indiana Commission.—The commission, appointed by Governor Ralston to select a site for the state's penal farm for short term prisoners, under an act of the 1913 legislature, has decided to buy the site near Putnamville, Ind., containing 1,567 acres. The total price to be paid for the tract by the state, including rights of way to the Monon and the Vandalia railroads, is \$57,000. The legislature appropriated \$60,000 to buy a tract of not less than five hundred acres.

The commission, as soon as it had decided on the site, made a formal report to the governor, setting out the advantages of the site offered and telling why it had selected it over a dozen others that had been in turn selected from fifty sites offered the commission throughout the state.

In the report the relative values of each tract of land in the thirteen sites finally considered were set out in terms of a scale of requirements, arbitrarily placed by the commission members. The Putnamville site scaled high in such points as stone, for building material and for road and agricultural material, water facilities, drainage and sewage disposal, railroad facilities, stock and fruit raising possibilities and agricultural facilities.

PENAL FARM SITE CHOSEN

The report of the commission to the governor follows, in part:

"In the consideration of the advantages and resources of the site stipulated by the organic act, the commission was early convinced of the difficulty, if not the impossibility, of locating any one square mile of land within the state which would embody all the requirements. While the language of the law, requiring that all or as many as practicable of the enumerated advantages and resources should be given consideration, was liberal enough, the commission, appreciating the objects and purposes of the new institution and the admitted fact that it is in a degree experimental, has kept in mind the determination to secure for it every advantage possible which makes for its success.

"In order that the necessities and facilities might be better measured and understood, the commission by committees visited the two similar institutions at Guelph, Ontario, and Occaquan, Va., and from each much valuable information was gathered which has assisted in the effort to solve the complex problem submitted to us. While the conditions at each of these institutions are unlike in many particulars and are also dissimilar to those existing in Indiana, yet the organic act of our proposed institution contemplates an establishment on the same general lines.

"To the commission the law seems clear and requires little interpretation. Unmistakably it outlines a reformatory institution which should be a beehive of well regulated and varied industries, which is expected to be uplifting and health-giving by reason of their industrial activities in the open air, and which when fully developed should be largely if not wholly self-supporting. It stipulates a site with a minimum of five hundred acres suitable for varied forms of husbandry, fruit growing and stock raising, brick making and the preparation of road and paving material with good railroad, drainage, sewerage and water facilities.

"It is the consensus of opinion that the institution should provide as soon as practicable for a population of five hundred prisoners and ultimately eight hundred or nine hundred. Having in view such a population and a necessity of finding employment for it, the commission reached the conclusion that the site selected must supply abundant raw material for industries requiring mainly unskilled labor, as only short term prisoners will be admitted.

"The land for farming and gardening purposes, although poor and neglected, may be developed and made to yield sufficient products for the maintenance of the population, but the income for improvements, new construction and the like must be derived from the sale of the industrial products. The farm and garden land could at best employ only a limited number of the prisoners and the majority must, therefore, find work in the industries. With this idea raw materials in proper quality and quantity become paramount in the selection of a site.

"The industries other than agricultural suggested by the statute are brickmaking and the preparation of road and paving material, and the required raw materials are clay, shales and stone, and, unfortunately, the best grades of each are not found in the same locality. The report of the geological surveys of Indiana, made by the state and general government experts, show beyond question that the Mitchell limestone produces the best road materials, and that this limestone is not found anywhere in the state in proximity to the knobstone or coal-bearing shales, which furnish the best shales for brickmaking. The commission has, in consequence, found itself confronted with the question of determining whether the proposed industries shall be limited to shale or stone products.

"Its investigations lead to a unanimous judgment in favor of the stone industries for the reason that stone supplies a larger number of industries, including lime burning, ground limestone for land treatment, crushed stone for road materials and stone for building purposes, and, therefore, affords employment for a larger number of men. The clays found covering the Mitchell limestone make a high grade soft

INTERNATIONAL PRISON CONGRESS

brick for which there is a limited demand. The shales for brickmaking, especially for paving blocks, are much desired and the demand is seemingly a growing one, but the industry could never be developed sufficiently to employ more than a relatively small proportion of the population of the proposed institution. Moreover, the commission became convinced from its own observation and from the advice of experts that the shale deposits vary in quantity and quality to such a degree that it would be imprudent, if not hazardous, to locate such a large institution on any of the sites offered with the expectation of securing its chief income from shale industries.

"The commission's conclusion in favor of the Mitchell stone-bearing land was reached only after a careful inspection of the best sites offered and a consideration of expert opinion upon the subject of paving and road making materials. * * *

"By the agreement, possession of these lands will be given to the state August 1, of the current year, with the exception of land, which may be in corn, which the owner will have the right to gather. The state, however, reserves the right to enter upon the lands and make such improvements as it may desire.

"The commission will proceed with the duty of transferring these lands to the state and with the payments therefor as authorized by the law and having completed the transaction it will submit an additional report."—From the *Indianapolis News*, Apr. 29, 1914. R. H. G.

Questions Admitted to the Programs of the IXth International Prison Congress, London, 1915, (July 26th).—Section I.—Criminal Law.—First Question.—Is it proper to leave to the authority which is charged with the duty of prosecution to decide as to its advisability?

If this is granted, ought such authority to be restricted within certain limits and subjected to control?

In this connection, is it proper to give to the judge the right not to pronounce sentence of guilty, even if the fact is substantially established?

Second Question.—Is recidivism in petty criminality sufficiently repressed by measures contained in present laws?

Would it be possible, and, if so, within what limits, to apply the principle of the indeterminate sentence?

Third Question.—Is it desirable to abolish or even to restrict, and in the latter case within what limits, the penalty of deprivation of civil rights?

Fourth Question.—Should measures be taken to facilitate and render more efficacious the communications between the various services of identification, especially by unifying:

- (a) The finger print cards, in relation to forms and order of taking impressions?
- (b) The anthropometric cards, in relation to forms, texts and abbreviations?
- (c) The formulas designed to furnish the police of another country information about the persons to be identified?

Should not every police administration take the initiative in informing the administration of the country when an individual has committed or is suspected of intending to commit crimes?

Section II.—Penal Institutions.—First Question.—If the system of *supplementary detention* is accepted as a means of repression in respect to recidivists, who have committed a grave offense, how ought this detention to be organized?